DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 694 SP 032 272

AUTHOR Sparapani, Ervin; Nelson, David
TITLE A Survey of AASCU Institutions: Compliance with Selected NCATE Standards at the Advanced Level.
PUB DATE 8 Feb 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators (Las Vegas, NV, February 5-8, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; *Advanced Courses; Degree Requirements; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teaching Load

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a survey of advanced programs in teacher education at member institutions of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). It is the opinion of researchers that several of the NCATE criteria apply more appropriately to basic programs than to advanced, especially in the categories related to the world of practice, students, and faculty. The purpose of the research, therefore, is to assess AASCU institutions' compliance with selected NCATE criteria in categories II, III, and IV (World of Practice, Students, and Faculty) which relate to: (1) relationships with graduates, (2) admission, (3) monitoring progress, (4) completion of the program, (5) faculty qualifications and assignments, and (6) faculty load. Results show, primarily, that few institutions (10 percent) have first-year assistance programs in place at the master's level, many institutions (22 percent) do nothing at the master's level to attract minority candidates, and institutions with student populations of less than 10,000 appear to have a serious faculty load problem. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED319694

# A SURVEY OF AASCU INSTITUTIONS COMPLIANCE WITH SELECTED NCATE STANDARDS AT THE ADVANCED LEVEL

Ervin Sparapani

David Nelson

Saginaw Valley State University
University Center, MI 48710

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Sparapani

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Las Vegas, Nevada, February 8, 1990.

SP 032 272

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In responding to the revised National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards(NCATE Standards, 1989), Saginaw Valley State University (SVSU) is experiencing some difficulty in responding to the criteria for compliance in Category II, Relationship to the World of Practice; Category III, Students; and Category IV, Faculty for its advanced (i.e. master's level) programs.

It is our perception that several of the criteria in these categories more appropriately apply to basic programs or doctoral programs rather than advanced master's programs. Also, when one considers the NCATE categories related to the World of Practice, Students, and Faculty, roles and responsibilities of those involved in professional teacher education seem more defined at the basic or doctoral levels than at the master's level. Additionally, since few teachers pursue advanced degrees beyond the master's degree, master's level programs seem to exist in limbo. Therefore, it seemed logical that those institutions which are members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the predominant producer of teachers in the United States, be surveyed relative to their compliance to the NCATE criteria in their master's level programs.

There are 371 members of AASCU ranging in size from small colleges with student populations of about 400 to large, comprehensive universities with more than 33,000 students. Member institutions are located throughout the United States, in Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. In addition, 30 state public

higher education systems belong to the association. AASCU was established with its membership open to any regionally accredited institution of higher education (1) offering programs leading to a degree of bachelor, master, or doctorate, and (2) wholly or partially state supported or state controlled.

Each year, more than 300,000 bachelor's degrees are awarded by AASCU-member institutions, approximately 32 percent of the total number of undergraduate degrees awarded in the nation. Many of the AASCU institutions were once state teachers' colleges or have teacher preparation as one of their major goals. More than 51 percent--or 44,717--of the 87,221 teachers who completed initial preparation programs in 1987, for example, were graduated at AASCU-member institutions. Additionally, each year AASCU institutions award approximately 45% of the master's degrees in teacher education and confer more than 2,200 doctorate degrees in education. Clearly, teacher preparation at the basic and advanced level is a major mission of AASCU institutions.

Not all of the 371 members of AASCU, however, have teacher preparation programs. The focus of this report is on the 247 AASCU institutions that prepare teachers, counselors, administrators, and other professional educators at the master's degree level. Of the 247 institutions, 98 of the institutions responded to the SVSU questionnaire requesting data on the criteria for compliance to the three categories mentioned previously.

The redesigned accreditation system of NCATE has been the subject of intense scrutiny in the national press during recent

months. Attention has centered on results of the first full year of institutional reviews. Of the 46 cases heard by the Unit Accreditation Board during the spring and fall 1989 sessions, 14 institutions were denied accreditation at one or both levels (basic or advanced) for which accreditation was sought. An additional institution was denied accreditation at the basic level, but accredited at the advanced level.

NCATE board members and staff are examining the reasons for the high rate of denials. Data from the spring 1989 reviews indicate that the three areas with the highest concentration of unmet criteria at both basic and advanced levels were "Design of the Curriculum" (under the knowledge base category), "Relationships with Graduates" (from the world of practice category), and the "Faculty Development" criterion (from the faculty category) which targets the continued professional education of faculty in the unit. Data from the fall 1989 reviews indicate similar results, but two additional standards were found wanting in a large percentage of institutions: "Faculty Qualifications and Assignments" and "Faculty Load" (NCATE Briefs, December 1989).

## METHOD

This report is a summary of findings from the SVSU "Questionnaire on NCATE Standards at the Advanced Level". Specifically, the questionnaire addresses the institutional response to the revised NCATE standards at the master's degree level. SVSU is an AASCU institution with basic and advanced

(master's level only) programs in professional education.

Balancing the desire to know a great deal about teacher education, basic and advanced, with a recognition that respondent burden can seriously affect the completeness and quality of the data led to the necessity of making many very difficult choices. Priorities gradually emerged, choices were made, and the instrument began to take shape. The final instrument solicited information regarding: (1) institutional demographics, (2) clinical and field-based experiences, (3) relationships with graduates, (4) admission requirements, (5) monitoring process, (6) exit criteria, (7) faculty qualifications, and (8) faculty load. The response rate for this instrument was about average for a survey; 98 of the 247 institutions, approximately 40% percent, returned the completed questionnaire.

## FINDINGS

### Relationship to the World of Practice

The Relationship to the World of Practice category (Category II) has three standards: (1) clinical and field-based experiences, (2) relationships with graduates, and (3) relationships with the schools. It is our opinion that the most troublesome criteria for most institutions will be the clinical and field-based experiences criteria in that standard and the first-year assistance criterion in the relationships with graduates standard. We believe that the relationships with schools standard will not be a problem. Tables 1, 2, and 3 display the data for the World of Practice items.

Table 1

Category II
Responses to World of Practice Items for
Clinical and Field-Based Experiences
N=98

| | |
|---|---|
| Clinical experiences required: | 64 (65%) YES |
| | 18 (18%) NO |
| Type of clinical experience required: | |
| Supervised field-based practicum and/or internship | 63 (64%) |
| Supervised field experience as part of course requirement | 36 (37%) |
| Microteaching | 10 (10%) |
| Other | 1 (1%) |
| Supervision of clinical experiences: | |
| Full-time university faculty | 65 (66%) |
| Part-time university faculty | 21 (21%) |
| School personnel | 18 (18%) |
| Self-evaluation | 5 (5%) |
| Graduate Students | 1 (1%) |
| Other | 1 (1%) |

Responses to the clinical and field-based experience items were interesting. It was our expectation that few institutions would require clinical experiences at the master's level, and those which did would require them as on-campus activities. The large majority of institutions responding (65%), however, indicated that they required clinical experiences, and that these clinical experiences were either field-based practica or internships. Further, 37% said that supervised field experiences were part of course requirements and 66% of the institutions said that the clinical experiences were supervised by full-time faculty. Apparently, institutions do more with master's level students in clinical field-based situations than one would expect. It would

be helpful to determine (perhaps in a future questionnaire) more about the nature of these clinical field based experiences.

Table 2

Category II
Responses to World of Practice Items for
Relationships with Graduates
N=98

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Follow up studies conducted: | | |
| Every semester | 0 (0%) | |
| Every year | 48 (49%) | |
| Every two years | 16 (16%) | |
| Other | 31 (32%) | |
| Type of instrument used: | | |
| Mail questionnaire to graduates: | 85 (87%) | |
| Mail questionnaire to employers | 57 (58%) | |
| Telephone survey | 2 ( 2%) | |
| On-site interview | 11 (11%) | |
| Other | 14 (14%) | |
| Person responsible for conducting follow-up study: | | |
| Administrator | 49 (50%) | |
| Faculty member | 31 (32%) | |
| Staff member | 8 ( 8%) | |
| Graduate assistant | 3 ( 3%) | |
| Other | 14 (14%) | |
| Release time or additional compensation: | 10 (10%) | Yes |
| | 39 (40%) | No |
| Dissemination of results: | | |
| Written report | 52 (53%) | |
| Internal report | 49 (50%) | |
| Oral presentation | 4 ( 4%) | |
| Other | 1 ( 1%) | |
| Provision for first-year assistance: | | |
| First-year assistance at basic level | 28 (29%) | Yes |
| | 61 (62%) | No |
| First-year assistance at the advanced level | 10 (10%) | Yes |
| | 73 (74%) | No |
| Assistance provided by: | | |
| Faculty | 25 (26%) | |
| On-site | 18 (18%) | |
| Staff development | 8 ( 8%) | |
| Other | 6 ( 6%) | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| State provides funding | 13 (13%) | Yes |
| | 75 (77%) | No |
| Institution allocates budget | 8 ( 8%) | Yes |
| | 83 (83%) | No |

Responses to the relationships with graduates items are as expected. Most institutions conduct follow-up studies of their graduates on an annual basis using a mail questionnaire. Few institutions (10%) provide first-year assistance and few institutions are provided with state funding (13%) or internal funding (8%). As institutions pursue accreditation, it will be interesting to see if provision for first-year assistance will increase dramatically, given the condition of scarce resources, and what form assistance programs will take.

Table 3

Category II
Responses to the World of Practice Items for
Relationships with Schools
N=98

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Formal written agreement with school district: | 74 (76%) | YES |
| | 18 (18%) | NO |
| Clinical field experiences | 81 (83%) | |
| Staff development programs | 41 (42%) | |
| School/University partnerships | 39 (40%) | |
| Cooperative research | 22 (22%) | |
| First-year programs | 17 (17%) | |
| Induction programs | 15 (15%) | |
| Faculty exchanges | 12 (12%) | |
| Other | 4 ( 4%) | |

Responses to the relationships with schools items are as anticipated. Over three-fourths (76%) of the respondents have formal, written agreements with school districts, but the vast majority (83%) of these agreements are for clinical field

experiences. After clinical field experiences, formal written agreements fall off dramatically. Less than half of the respondents, for example, say that they have formal agreements in the other areas. This is interesting, especially when considering the national support in the professional literature for school/university partnerships, first-year assistance programs, and cooperative research activities.

**Students**

The Student category (Category III) has four standards: (1) admission to the program (which includes incentives and affirmative action procedures to attract qualified candidates from culturally diverse populations), (2) monitoring students as they progress through the program, (3) advisory services, and (4) completion of the program. At SVSU, we are struggling with incentive and affirmative action procedures and with questions such as: What constitutes a comprehensive set of criteria for admission (specifically, are faculty recommendations and standardized testing required)? Who monitors admission criteria? and How is competence measured at exit (specifically, is it necessary to require a comprehensive final examination and/or a standardized test at exit, or will a "capstone" course be sufficient)?

Our opinion is that few institutions do much at the master's level in the area of affirmative action. Likewise, it is our opinion that most institutions require faculty and educator recommendations and mandate a standardized test, usually the GRE or the NTE, at admission, and that a variety of assessment

procedures will be used to measure competence at exit (in addition to the capstone course). Tables 4, 5, and 6 display the data for the Student items.

Table 4

Category III
Responses to Student Items for
Incentives Used to Attract Minority Candidates
N=98

| | |
|---|---|
| Scholarships | 40 (41%) |
| Off-campus courses | 31 (32%) |
| Teaching assistantships | 29 (29%) |
| Cooperative arrangements with schools | 6 ( 6%) |
| Other | 9 ( 9%) |
| None | 22 (22%) |

Responses to the items focused at incentives used to attract minority candidates are not especially surprising. Of those responding, most institutions offer traditional incentives. Also, many institutions, 22% of those responding, are doing little or nothing to attract minority candidates. Perhaps those institutions which are offering no incentives are in a location where it is not necessary to provide such incentives.

Table 5

Category III
Responses to Student Items for
Admission and Advisement
N=98

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Measurement of academic proficiency at admission: | | | |
| Grade point average (GPA) | 82 | (84%) | |
| Standardized admission test | 66 | (67%) | |
| Faculty recommendations | 48 | (49%) | |
| Oral interview | 25 | (25%) | |
| Other | 7 | ( 7%) | |
| Standardized test results required at admission: | 69 | (70%) | YES |
| | 16 | (16%) | NO |
| GRE | 58 | (59%) | |
| MAT | 24 | (24%) | |
| NTE | 8 | ( 8%) | |
| Other | 5 | ( 5%) | |
| Minimum score required | 55 | (56%) | YES |
| | 20 | (20%) | NO |
| Faculty recommendations required | 44 | (45%) | YES |
| | 39 | (40%) | NO |
| Practioner/supervisor recommendations required | 31 | (32%) | YES |
| | 52 | (53%) | NO |
| Baccalaureate degree from regionally accredited | 85 | (87%) | YES |
| college or university required: | 1 | ( 1%) | NO |
| Person monitoring admission criteria: | | | |
| Administrator | 58 | (59%) | |
| Department Chair | 26 | (26%) | |
| Committee | 25 | (25%) | |
| Individual faculty | 7 | ( 7%) | |
| Staff person | 6 | ( 6%) | |
| Other | 17 | (17%) | |
| Policy regarding unsatisfactory progress: | 82 | (84%) | YES |
| | 3 | ( 3%) | NO |
| Person monitoring policy: | | | |
| Administrator | 62 | (63%) | |
| Committee | 20 | (20%) | |
| Department chair | 17 | (17%) | |
| Individual faculty | 11 | (11%) | |
| Staff person | 4 | ( 4%) | |
| Other | 11 | (11%) | |
| Formal advisement system exists | 84 | (86%) | YES |
| | 2 | ( 2%) | NO |

Responses to the admission and advisement items show no major surprises. Most institutions use GPA (84%) and standardized admissions tests (67%) as measures of academic proficiency. Also, most institutions (70%) require standardized test results prior to admission. It is interesting also that a majority of institutions (56%) require a **minimum** test score. Our expectation was that most institutions would require standardized test results as a criterion for admission to a master's level program, but would not require a minimum score.

Institutions are about evenly divided on the issue of requiring faculty recommendations (45% to 40%), but the majority of institutions (53%) do not require practioner or supervisor recommendations (even though such a requirement is clearly stated in the NCATE guidelines). Most institutions (87%) require a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution; however, one does not have such a policy. Most institutions (84%) have a policy regarding unsatisfactory progress. Most institutions (86%) have a formal system of advisement in place.

Table 6

Category III
Responses to Student Items for
Completion of Program
N=98

| | |
|---|---|
| Requirements for assessing competency at completion of program: | |
| Comprehensive final examination | 63 (64%) |
| Major paper/project | 34 (35%) |
| Thesis | 34 (35%) |
| Oral defense or review | 28 (28%) |
| Capstone course | 15 (15%) |
| Standardized test | 3 ( 3%) |
| Other | 6 ( 6%) |

Responses to the items focussed at completion of the program surprised us. Our expectation was that few institutions would require a formal examination at exit from their master's programs, and most require a capstone course. Such was not the case. Most institutions (64%) required a comprehensive final examination at exit and another 3% required a standardized test. A major paper or project, a thesis, and an oral defense also were required by more institutions than expected. Few institutions (15%) required a capstone course. It will be interesting to observe how exit requirements change as institutions pursue accreditation.

Faculty

The Faculty category (Category IV) contains four standards: (1) faculty qualifications and assignments, (2) faculty load, (3) faculty development, and (4) faculty evaluation. In our survey we were mainly interested in gathering information concerning faculty qualifications and assignments, and faculty load.

The first NCATE standard in the faculty category suggests that faculty in professional education be qualified to perform their assignments. The criteria for compliance to this standard include: (1) faculty reflect cultural diversity, (2) faculty have terminal degrees or have exceptional expertise in their fields, (3) faculty view themselves as members of the training and research arms of the teaching profession, (4) faculty with responsibility for supervision of school-based experiences have training in supervision, (5) part-time faculty meet the requirements for appointment to the full-time faculty, (6) graduate students who are assigned to instructional roles are qualified, and (7) cooperating teachers and other field-based supervisors have a minimum of three years of experience. Results for each criterion are discussed separately.

1. Cultural Diversity

It should surprise no one that as a group, the full-time AASCU professorate in the education unit is about two-thirds white male and slightly over one-quarter white female. The remainder, approximately seven percent of the professorate at AASCU institutions, is classified as minority. Approximately five percent of the professional education faculty is minority male and less than three percent is minority female. This finding is consistent with the results from the Research about Teacher Education (RATE) Project sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). The RATE survey (Galluzzo and Arends, 1989) indicates that regardless of stratum or gender,

full professors average 53 years-of-age, associate professors average 47 years-of-age, and assistant professors about 42 years-of-age. Approximately 90 percent of all professors and associate professors hold a doctorate and approximately two-thirds of the assistant professors hold a doctorate. The RATE survey indicates that less than seven percent of the professional education faculty at all institutions is minority. The stereotypical image of the "graying" white male professor of education is supported by these data.

Obviously, the issue of providing cultural diversity is a major challenge for professional education in the future. The situation has been recently exacerbated by the fact that there is a serious reduction of qualified candidates for teacher education positions at a time when increased demand and greater numbers of persons are retiring. Perhaps a national policy which promotes the availability of minority candidates to K-12 and higher education should be considered.

2. Faculty Possess a Terminal Degree or Exceptional Expertise

The data from the SVSU survey indicate that at 63 of the 98 institutions (64%) all full-time faculty members who teach at the advanced level hold a terminal degree. Presumably at the other 35 institutions, faculty members in advanced programs have exceptional expertise or are qualified through advanced study or demonstrated competence. This finding is consistent with the RATE survey. Interestingly, our survey indicates that institutions do not perceive this to be a serious problem.

This reaction is contrary to the NCATE findings for institutional accreditation cited previously which indicate that faculty qualifications were deficient at many of the institutions reviewed in 1989. Some institutions in our survey identified the reasons for this discrepancy. Specifically, these institutions pointed to: (1) problems of limited staff and resources, (2) faculty members employed when a terminal degree was not required, (3) institutional autonomy, and (4) collective bargaining agreements.

The NCATE criterion suggests that faculty possess either a terminal degree or demonstrate exceptional expertise in their fields. Institutions are in agreement: the burden of responsibility for demonstrating exceptional expertise is the responsibility of the individual institution seeking accreditation. Most persons familiar with the NCATE standards agree that in most instances, experience teaching a course is not adequate for demonstrating exceptional expertise. A faculty member may be qualified by some combination of: (1) a unique work experience, (2) independent study, (3) advanced course work in a subject area, and (4) participation on a regular and ongoing basis in activities sponsored by a learned society.

**3. Faculty View Themselves as Members of the Training and Research Arm of the Teaching Profession**

The data from the survey indicate that most institutions are in compliance with this criterion. The persons who responded to the survey, usually an administrator, expressed general

satisfaction with the ideal that faculty view themselves as members of the training and research arms of the profession. At almost every AASCU institution, teacher preparation is perceived as the most important mission of the unit at both the basic and advanced levels. As such, faculty participate in school-based research and training activities on a regular basis.

Additionally, responding institutions indicated general satisfaction with the scholarly activities of faculty members in the unit. The most frequently cited concern by the administrators was the lack of resources, release time and budget, to support research efforts to the level of faculty requests. For example, funding for travel, support services, and research assistance was noted as a serious problem at many institutions (63%). To promote scholarship, respondents noted that their institutions defined research in general terms to encompass the wide range of faculty activities.

4. Supervision of School-Based Experiences

Undergraduate school-based supervision has been widely explored and frequently studied. The NCATE criteria for compliance regarding supervision, however, need responses for both basic and advanced programs. Little meaningful data on supervision of students at the advanced level was obtained from our survey. In fact, our data indicate that supervision of school-based experiences at the advanced level is limited to a single course that is either a field-based practicum or an internship (64%). The data further indicate that students are seldom supervised. The

reasons are noted as follows: (1) the large number of persons (teachers) taking courses on a part-time basis, (2) the geographic spread of the students, (3) the diversity of the population in terms of teaching assignment, and (4) the appropriateness of supervision at the advanced level.

Not surprising, most graduate students have a practicum or internship which requires some type of supervised experience. This course is often the only supervised field-based experience. Such courses are usually taught by qualified, full-time faculty, and it is usually the final course taken in the student's program. According to the SVSU survey not only do faculty who supervise have training in supervision, many teach a course in supervision in that area of professional education. Thus, training in supervision per se is not perceived as an area of concern or weakness at the advanced level. What is a weakness, however, are the number and type of supervised field experiences.

5. Part-time Faculty

With regard to the questionnaire item: do all part-time faculty members who teach at the advanced level hold a terminal degree?, the response was varied. Forty-three (44%) of the respondents indicated that all adjunct faculty held the terminal degree while 45 institutions (46%) indicated that some portion of their part-time faculty did not hold a terminal degree.

The SVSU survey indicated that more than fifty percent of the institutions employ adjunct faculty who do not possess a terminal degree and do not seem to view this as a problem. It is interesting

to speculate the reasons for this reaction. A typical response may be that there are many part-time faculty who are well-qualified by virtue of their professional area of responsibility. (The standard is quite clear, institutional approval to teach graduate courses is usually required, and their is no contractual commitment to adjunct faculty. In addition, most institutions define "exceptional expertise" as professional experience. Based upon the survey results, professional experience is usually interpreted by a faculty evaluation, administrative evaluation, or some combination. There is no indication that a common definition exists for the term "exceptional expertise;" it is an internal decision made my the faculty and/or administration.)

**6. Graduate Students**

Relatively few respondents (N=5) use graduate teaching assistants to teach courses at the basic or advanced level. Of those institutions that responded, graduate students teach courses at the undergraduate level only. No AASCU institution mentioned that graduate students are used to teach courses at the master's level. Our conclusion is that since most AASCU institutions are master's degree institutions, it would be highly unusual for a graduate student to teach an advanced course.

**7. Minimum Teaching Experience**

All AASCU institutions indicate that they are aware of the three years of teaching experience expectation for field-based supervisors. This criterion is recommended for supervision of basic students, e.g., student teachers. Our data indicate that

AASCU institutions are in compliance with this expectation. At the advanced level, however, the recommendation for three years of teaching experience is interpreted somewhat differently as most graduate students are supervised by a university faculty member. All respondents indicate that full-time faculty have a minimum of three years of teaching experience.

**Faculty Load**

NCATE Standard IV.B addresses the issue of faculty load. As such, the unit must ensure that policies allow for faculty opportunities in teaching, scholarship, and service. There are three criteria for compliance: (1) workload assignments accommodate faculty involvement in teaching, research, and service; (2) the teaching load of graduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of nine semester hours; and (3) faculty keep abreast of developing work and debates about the research on teaching and professional education.

The first criterion is seldom an issue at most institutions. Work load assignments usually accommodate faculty involvement in teaching, research, and service, including curriculum development, institutional committee work, and other internal responsibilities. As mentioned, most AASCU institutions have recognized the importance of teacher preparation and have recognized the unique requirements of a teacher education unit.

The second criterion is one of the few quantifiable standards endorsed by NCATE--the teaching load of undergraduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of 12 semester hours; the teaching load

of graduate faculty is no more than the equivalent of nine semester hours. At most AASCU institutions, faculty members often teach a combination of undergraduate and graduate courses.

Table 7 presents a summary of the data on faculty load.

Table 7

Category IV
Responses to Faculty Items for
Faculty Load
N=98

| Institution Size | 0-3,000 | 3,000-5,000 | 5,000-7,500 | 7,500-10,000 | 10,000-15,000 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Semester Hours (Undergraduate) | 12.58 | 11.28 | 12.20 | 12.97 | 11.68 |
| No. of Courses (Undergraduate) | 3.72 | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.31 | 3.69 |
| Semester Hours (Graduate) | 10.93 | 12.20 | 10.36 | 12.02 | 8.02 |
| No. of Courses (Graduate) | 3.56 | 3.75 | 3.44 | 3.42 | 2.99 |
| Semester Hours (Undergraduate & Grad) | 11.75 | 11.14 | 11.05 | 12.63 | 10.08 |
| No. of Courses (Undergraduate & Grad) | 3.58 | 4.36 | 3.51 | 3.77 | 3.75 |

The data are organized by institutional size and the mean number of hours taught by faculty members at each level--basic and advanced. At AASCU institutions, there are few differences in faculty load at the basic level, and institutions are within the NCATE suggestion of twelve (12) semester hours per semester.

At the advanced level, however, there are significant differences in faculty load at institutions of various size.

Specifically, when faculty members teach at the master's level only, the range in class load is 12.20 at small institutions to 8.02 at larger institutions. Not surprising, the larger institutions, those with more than 10,000 students, had a lower faculty load than intermediate size institutions, those with 3,000 to 5,000 students. It appears that at larger institutions there is larger availability of advanced level courses and more faculty members in the professional education are involved. The data indicate that the mean faculty load at small institutions (0-3,000), intermediate institutions (3,000 to 5,000), and medium institutions (5,000 to 7,500) exceed the NCATE recommendation of nine (9) hours at the graduate level. This finding is consistent with the concerns raised by the Unit Accreditation Board and the citations issued to some institutions in the 1989 review.

At many AASCU institutions faculty in education teach a combination of undergraduate and graduate level courses. As shown in Table 7, the range of faculty load teaching both advanced and basic courses is from 11.75 to 10.08 semester hours. As expected, the average faculty load for a combination of advanced and basic courses at larger institutions (10.08) is within the NCATE guidelines. At medium-size schools, however, the average faculty load is 12.63 semester hours. In other words, faculty are teaching about the same number of hours as professors of basic level courses which exceeds the NCATE expectation. At small and intermediate-size institutions, the mean is somewhat lower (11.75 and 11.14) but also in excess of the NCATE guideline.

Data on the number of course taught were also obtained. The SVSU survey indicated that the mean number of courses taught was higher than four (4) at the basic level at intermediate and medium size institutions, and greater than three (3) at the graduate level (only) level at small, intermediate, and medium-size institutions. At the small institutions, unit instructors taught an average of 4.36 courses at the basic and advanced level, clearly above the NCATE criterion. At intermediate, medium, and large institutions, unit instructors taught from 3.51 to 3.75 courses per semester. Although a detailed analysis must be made on a case-by-case basis, the data suggest that faculty load is in excess of the NCATE criterion.

Therefore, after carefully examining the results of the SVSU and other survey reports, many units of professional education have a serious faculty resource problem. Simply stated, many institutions are relying on overload teaching to cover their courses and at many institutions faculty load is in excess of the NCATE accreditation guidelines. This is and will continue to present a serious challenge to administrators and faculty in professional education when scarce resources and limited budgets are often the norm.

## CONCLUSIONS

The purpose for conducting this survey was to obtain current information about AASCU institutions' compliance with the criteria in the NCATE categories related to World of Practice, Students and Faculty for master's level programs. It was our perception that several of the criteria in these categories were more appropriate for basic and doctoral programs, and that institutions could either not be in compliance at the master's level, or would have difficulty being in compliance.

For the World of Practice category, it was our opinion that the most problematic areas at the master's level would be criteria related to clinical and field-based experiences, and first-year assistance. Our data, however, showed that the majority of institutions (65%) required some form of supervised clinical experiences. Our data further indicated, however, that few of the institutions responding (10%) had first-year assistance programs in place at the advanced level.

For the Student category, we were mainly interested in obtaining information about affirmative action procedures and incentives, admission criteria, and measuring competence at exit. It was our opinion that few institutions did much at the master's level in the area of affirmative action, most institutions would have a variety of entrance criteria including standardized test results and faculty recommendations, and most institutions would use a variety of assessment procedures to measure competence at exit.

Our data showed that most institutions offered traditional incentive (i.e., scholarships, off-campus courses, and teaching assistantships) to attract minority candidates, and many institutions (22%) did nothing. Our data about admission criteria showed that most institutions required a minimum GPA and standardized test scores as measures of academic proficiency. Interestingly, a majority of institutions required a minimum test score. The responses to the exit criteria items surprised us. Most institutions (64%) required a comprehensive final examination at exit, and over one-third required a major paper/project or thesis. Also, close to 30% of the institutions required an oral defence or review at exit. Few institutions (15%), however, required some form of capstone course.

In the Faculty category, we were mainly interested in gathering information regarding faculty qualifications and assignments and faculty load. Our data showed that AASCU institution's full-time faculty were not very culturally diverse, held terminal degrees, or had exceptional expertise and viewed themselves as members of the training and research arms of the profession. Fifty percent (50%) of the institutions, however, employed adjunct faculty who did not hold terminal degrees. Interestingly, these institutions did not view this as a problem. Concerning faculty load, our data showed that only those institutions with 10,000 or more students met the NCATE criterion of nine (9) hours at the graduate level. All data obtained in the Faculty category were consistent with previous research (i.e.,

Galluzzo and Arends 1989; NCATE Briefs, 1989) which suggested that many institutions had a serious faculty resource problem.

This survey was conducted to determine institutional responses to selected NCATE criteria for master's level students. Some of the data supported our initial intentions; some did not. It will be interesting to watch how institutions change in the categories studied as more and more institutions pursue accreditation under the revised NCATE guidelines.

## REFERENCES


Galluzzo, G.R. & Arends, R.I. (1989). The RATE project: A profile of teacher education institutions. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(4), pp. 56-58.

NCATE Briefs, (December 1989). High NCATE denial rate catches spotlight. AACTE Briefs, pp. 15-16.

NCATE Standards, Procedures, and Policies for the Accreditation of Professional Education Units. (1987). Washington, D.C.: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.